



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,683	07/14/2005	Holger Von Hayn	PC10706US	5197
23122	7590	04/14/2010	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			KING, BRADLEY T	
P.O. BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482			PAPER NUMBER	
			3657	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			04/14/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,683

Applicant(s)

VON HAYN ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley T. King

Art Unit

3657

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-29, 31, 32 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-25, 30-33, 35-38 and 42-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 39-41 and 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/02/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22-25, 36-38, 42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartl et al (US# 5813230).

Hartl et al discloses all the limitations of the instant claims including; comprising a simulator 2 which can be acted upon by a brake pedal, with an output signal of an actuation sensor being sent to an electronic control unit which controls a pressure source in response to the signal of the actuation sensor, and with an output of the pressure source that is connected to a distributor device for the brake force and actuates individual wheel brakes of the vehicle (see column 3, lines 13-25), also

comprising means for enabling actuation of the brakes by muscular power within a fallback mode(column 3, lines 34-60), wherein a lost travel is provided between a first actuation component 1 defined as a component articulated at the brake pedal and a second actuation component 33 that is connected downstream in the flux of force are configured relative to one another such that the first actuation component 1 is freely moveable relative to the second actuation component 33 in a direction toward the second actuation component prior to actuation of the brake pedal such that a lost travel (via space 39) is defined between the first and second actuation components in order to uncouple the first actuation component mechanically from the reactions of force of the motor vehicle brake system in a by-wire mode. See figure 3. The embodiments of figures 1-2 and 4 are also applicable.

Regarding claim 23, means 35-37.

Regarding claim 24, see electromagnetic actuator 36. also note column 6, lines 62-64.

Regarding claim 25, see clutch 35-37.

Regarding claim 36, see spring 32.

Regarding claim 37, see figure 1.

Regarding claims 38 and 42, the clutch shaft 33 or 29 is engagable with the input member in an axial direction.

Claims 22-25, 36-38, 42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heibel et al (US# 6233932).

Heibel et al discloses all the limitations of the instant claims including; comprising a simulator 70 which can be acted upon by a brake pedal, with an output signal 88 of an actuation sensor being sent to an electronic control unit which controls a pressure source in response to the signal of the actuation sensor, and with an output of the pressure source that is connected to a distributor device for the brake force and actuates individual wheel brakes of the vehicle, also comprising means for enabling actuation of the brakes by muscular power within a fallback mode, wherein a lost travel is provided between a first actuation component 60 defined as a component articulated at the brake pedal and a second actuation component 66 that is connected downstream in the flux of force are configured relative to one another such that the first actuation component 60 remains mechanically uncoupled from the second actuation component 66 during a by-wire mode with a lost travel remaining between the first and second actuation components during the by-wire mode.

Regarding claim 23, means 114.

Regarding claim 24, note the means is hydraulic.

Regarding claim 36, see spring 70.

Regarding claims 38 and 42, note clutch shaft 66.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartl et al (US# 5813230).

Regarding claim 30, Hartl et al disclose all the limitations of the instant claim with exception to the explicit disclosure of a pneumatic booster. Instead, Hartl suggests the broader "power brake device". The Examiner takes official notice that pneumatic boosters are a well known type of power brake device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a pneumatic booster, as known in the art, for the power brake device of Hartl et al as an obvious means of implementing the device which yields the predictable results of proper brake actuation.

Regarding claims 33 and 35, Hartl et al discloses all the limitations of the instant claims with exception to the explicit disclosure of detecting deviations with a pressure sensor. Hartl et al does disclose the detection of a functional disturbance of the brake system and activate a fall-back mode, however the reference is silent as to the manner of sensing the disturbance. The Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to determine brake function of a hydraulic brake system through pressure sensor readings and deviations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor pressure deviations in the device of Hartl et al, as known in the art, as an obvious means of determination of the functional disturbance which yields the predictable results of proper emergency detection.

Claims 30, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heibel et al (US# 6233932).

Regarding claim 30, Heibel et al disclose all the limitations of the instant claim with exception to the explicit disclosure of a pneumatic booster. The Examiner takes official notice that pneumatic boosters are a well known type of power brake device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a pneumatic booster, as known in the art, for the power brake device of Heibel et al as an obvious means of implementing the device which yields the predictable results of proper brake actuation.

Regarding claims 33 and 35, Heibel et al discloses all the limitations of the instant claims with exception to the explicit disclosure of detecting deviations with a pressure sensor. The Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to determine brake function of a hydraulic brake system through pressure sensor readings and deviations.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor pressure deviations in the device of Heibel et al, as

known in the art, as an obvious means of determination of the functional disturbance which yields the predictable results of proper emergency detection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 39-41 and 43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04/02/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the limitation of "mechanically uncoupled", the limitation has been given the broadest reasonable interpretation of mechanically connected to move together. The specification fails to provide any explicit definition. The spring of Hartl provides a restoring force and further allows uncoupled relative movement between the members. It is maintained that the rejection is proper.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley T. King whose telephone number is (571) 272-7117. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:00-7:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Siconolfi can be reached on (571) 272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bradley T King/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3657

BTK